

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT SEATTLE  
11

12                  UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

13                  Plaintiff,

14                  v.

15                  LUIS ALBERTO VALENZUELA HARO,

16                  Defendant.

17                  CASE NO. 2:22-cr-00190-LK

18                  ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
19                  SEAL

20         This matter comes before the Court on the Government's unopposed motion to seal Exhibit  
21 A to its sentencing memorandum. Dkt. No. 53. The Government states that Exhibit A (Linesheets)  
22 contains "the contents of judicially authorized interception of wire and oral communications,"  
23 including communications from individuals who have not been charged in this matter, and 18  
24 U.S.C. § 2517 "requires that these wiretap interceptions be sealed and remain so except under  
narrowly defined circumstances, including while giving testimony under oath." *Id.* at 1–2; *see also*  
Dkt. No. 54 (sealed Exhibit A).

25         "Historically, courts have recognized a 'general right to inspect and copy public records  
26 and documents, including judicial records and documents.'" *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of*

1     *Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435  
2 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). However, Section 2517 limits when information collected from  
3 wiretapping may be disclosed. Courts in the Ninth Circuit have interpreted the statutory provisions  
4 as “prohibiting the public disclosure of [wiretapping] material until after it has been admitted into  
5 evidence in a criminal trial or at a suppression hearing.” *United States v. Rand*, No. 3:16-cr-00029-  
6 MMD-WGC, 2016 WL 6208265, at \*3 (D. Nev. Oct. 24, 2016); *see also United States v. Kwok*  
7 *Cheung Chow*, No. 14-cr-00196-CRB (JCS), 2015 WL 5094744, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2015)  
8 (“Courts have generally held that in light of Title III’s purpose of safeguarding privacy, the  
9 statute’s list of permissible disclosures is exclusive—in other words, ‘what is not permitted [under  
10 § 2517] is forbidden.’” (quoting *United States v. Dorfman*, 690 F.2d 1230, 1234 (7th Cir. 1982)).

11 The Court has reviewed the document at issue, which comprises the contents of judicially-  
12 authorized interceptions of wire and oral communications, including communications with  
13 individuals who have not been charged in this matter. Dkt. No. 54. Redaction is not a feasible  
14 alternative to sealing. The Court finds that the document may remain under seal pursuant to 18  
15 U.S.C. § 2517. *See Kwok Cheung Chow*, 2015 WL 5094744, at \*7.

16 The Court therefore GRANTS the motion to seal. Dkt. No. 53. Exhibit A may remain under  
17 seal. Dkt. No. 54.

18 || Dated this 19th day of March, 2025.

Lauren King  
Lauren King  
United States District Judge